



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V. — The Story of the Strix: Isidorus and the Glossographers

BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL GRANT OLIPHANT

GROVE CITY COLLEGE

IN a former paper¹ I endeavored to show that the ancient literature² of Greece and Rome during the seven centuries from Boio to Sammonicus presents us a fairly consistent view of the strix, and that the fancy of the ancients invested this mythic "bird" with the physical attributes of a bat rather than with those of an owl, as had been so generally supposed. In this paper I aim to present the continuation of the story in Isidorus, and from the meagre data preserved from unknown sources by the glossographers to elicit such information as will at least faintly illumine the darkness of the past.

Isidorus, in his *Origines*, XI, 4, 2, writes :

Quidam asserunt strigas³ ex hominibus fieri. Ad multa enim latrocinia figurae sceleratorum mutantur, et sive magicis cantibus, sive barbarum veneficio, totis corporibus in feras transeunt.

¹ "The Story of the Strix: Ancient," *T.A.P.A.* XLIV, 133 ff.

² Add to the passages on the Tartarean birds, quoted on p. 138 of the former article, this passage from Silius Italicus, XIII, 595 ff.:

Dextra vasta comas nemorosaque brachia fundit
Taxus, Cocyti rigua frondosior unda.
Hic dirae volucres, pastusque cadavere vultur,
Et multus bubo, ac sparsis strix sanguine pennis,
Harpyiaeque foveant nidos, atque omnibus haerent
Condensae foliis; saevit stridoribus arbor.
Has inter formas coniux Iunonis Avernae
Suggestu residens, cognoscit crimina regum.

³ This heteroclitic form is much older than Isidorus. It seems to have become common among the people as early as the fourth century A.D., for the maleficent, cannibal witch, as it is the parent form of the Gallic *stria*, found in the *Lex Salica* of the fifth century. From it have descended also the Italian *strega* and *stregone*, the Old French *estrie*, and the Spanish *estrige*. Roman soldiers and colonists carried the term to the Danubian districts. There the wandering Wallachian herdsmen caught it up and carried it far afield, as shown by the Slovenian *štrija*, the Russian *stryga*, the Polish *stryga*, the Albanian *štrijëa*, etc. From it were

This is the strix of Verrius Flaccus, Ovid (*Am.* i, 8, 13 f., *Fasti*, vi, 141 ff.), and Petronius (63), with two additional features, — the admission of the male of the species to strigism and the extension of the strigine form from the avian alone to the ferine also. Both of these recur in mediaeval literature.

Isidorus returns to the subject in xii, 7, 42 :

Strix, nocturna avis, habens nomen de sono vocis. Quando enim clamat stridet. . . . Haec avis vulgo dicitur Amma, ab amando parvulos, unde et lac praeberere fertur nascentibus.

Here at first sight we seem to have a transformed, a re-deemed strix. There is not a word of its malevolent, maleficent nature. How little we should know of the strix, were this our only reference ! What a misconception we should have of it as a loving nurse of the infants rather than a vampire sucking their hearts' blood ! We almost feel that the Christian prelate has wilfully suppressed much of the heathen superstition. He gives a new name, *Amma*, but everything else here is old. *Nocturna avis* is common from the time of Boio. The derivation from *stridere* is as old as Ovid. The *lac . . . nascentibus* reflects Pliny rather than Titinius and Sammonicus. The *amando parvulos* is a survival of the ancient proverbial Γελλοῦς παιδοφιλωτέρα and the myth of the Γελλώ. Its ultimate origin long forgotten, or never known, by the masses, a folk-etymology has applied it to explain the term Amma. The proneness to popular euphemisms, due to that widely prevalent belief in the mystic power of names to

formed also the diminutives, in form, στρίγλα, στρίγγλος, στρίγγλαις, etc., of Byzantine and later Greek.

The grammarians indicate that the form arose from confusion with another *striga*. Thus Charisius (Keil, *Gram. Lat.* i, 109, 14) says: Strigem hanc in significatione avis dicas; striga autem castrense est vocabulum, intervallum turmarum significans, in quo equi stringuntur, unde et strigosi dicuntur corpore macilento. Again (i, 144, 9) he says: Strix avis dicitur et declinatur strix, strigis, strigi, strigem, strix a strige. In Capri *de Verbis Dubiis* (Keil, vii, 111, 11) we find: Striges, non strigas: striga intervallum turmarum. Beda (*de Orthog.* Keil, vii, 291, 15 ff.) repeats the former quotation from Charisius.

As usual, the grammarians could not stay the tide, and *striga*, rather than *strix*, became propagative in the rising language of the masses.

work out their own fulfilment, a basic principle in Indo-European onomatology,⁴ would further this process. The folk-etymology was, in this instance, the reverse of the true.⁵ Amma had descended from the prehistoric Indo-European nursery,⁶ but Isidorus could not know this. Hesychius defines Ἀμμᾶς thus: ἡ τροφὸς Ἀρτέμιδος. καὶ μήτηρ. καὶ ἡ Ῥέα. καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ. Much better is the *Ety. Mag.*: Ἀμμά, ἡ τροφὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, κατὰ ὑποκόρισμον. καὶ ἡ Ῥέα λέγεται καὶ ἀμμάς, καὶ ἀμμία.⁷ These are fully in accord with modern philology, and the passage from Titinius shows why the name came to be given to the strix.

Thus out of his etymological treasure the most profound scholar of the seventh century has brought us forth things new and old. His *Origines* became the apparent origin of the gloss in the *Liber Glossarum* — Amma, avis nocturna — and of that in the once famous book of Papias, the *Rudimentum Elementarium* (published in 1053) — Amma, avis nocturna ab amando dicta, haec et strix dicitur a stridere.

To the glossographers we are indebted for a fund of information relative to the striga and the strix. This flotsam from works long lost may well indicate how great may have been our unsuspected losses in numerous instances.

The *Latino-Graecum Glossarium* that has come down to us under the name of the East-Roman Philoxenus,⁸ glosses *Striga* by λαιστρυγών,⁹ καὶ γυνή φαρμακίς, Κιμωλία, and *Strix* by ὀλολυγών, στρουθός. Comparison of these with the glosses given in the *Graeco-Latinum Glossarium* that bears the name of the Alexandrian Cyrillus shows that only in the

⁴ See the present writer in *Class. Jour.* VII, 169 ff.

⁵ See Walde, *s.v. amo*.

⁶ See Uhlenbeck, *s.v. amba*; Walde, *s.v. amita*; Kretschmer, *Einleitung in d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache*, 339.

⁷ Other meanings of the word are clear in their semantic development, but this has never, so far as I know, been adequately presented. Too long for a note, an account of this must be reserved for that group of studies that are resulting as by-products of the story of the strix.

⁸ Here cited from the *Glossaria Labbaei* in Valpy's ed. of Stephanus' *Thesaurus*, vol. XI (VIII in some copies). The notation employed makes Philoxenus authority for the foregoing glosses.

⁹ The emendation of Bonaventura Vulcanius for the Ms. reading λωστρυγών.

first two of them do we have regularly convertible terms. In the other three we have only occasional and figurative usages.

In the equation, *striga* = *λαιστρογών*, we have an obvious reference to the anthropophagous strix of Plautus, Ovid, and Petronius. This was already inherent in the Boioan myth. What is more interesting, however, in this equation, is that it seems to suggest a popular etymology for the name of the giant cannibals of the *Odyssey* as signifying the 'big striges.' This etymology would be all but inevitable, if the title of the *opusculum* *Περὶ στρυγγών*, attributed to Johannes Damascenus, exhibits a collateral form of *στρίξ*, that was more or less current at the time.

Our second gloss, — *striga*, *γυνή φαρμακίς*, — presents the woman of magic and witchcraft, already known from Verrius, Ovid, and Petronius, the development of an element implicit in Boio. As this is the one meaning of the term that will confront us almost everywhere in the mediaeval and modern literature of the *striga*, we need not dwell upon it now.

Our third gloss, — *striga*, *Κιμωλία*, — has for its reverse in Cyrillus, — *Κιμωλία*, Creta, Sarda, *Striga*. Cimolus, one of the small Cyclades, was famed for its earth, or chalk, ἡ *Κιμωλία γῆ*. This was of two kinds, one white, the other purplish.¹⁰ Both were heavy, sodaic,¹¹ readily soluble in water, much used in the baths, barber shops, laundries, and fulleries, as well as in medicine. Pliny (*N.H.* xxxv, 17, 195 ff.) mentions Cimolia¹² as a kind of Creta and Sarda¹³ as a kind of Cimolia. These three terms, then, are in some measure synonymous. Not so, however, with *striga*, the other term in the gloss. Why is *Κιμωλία* an epithet of the *striga*? An examination of the ancient sources suggests two reasons. One of these is its refrigerant¹⁴ nature; the other its effect

¹⁰ Dioscorides, *de Mat. Med.* v, 176: τῆς δὲ Κιμωλίας ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ λευκή, ἡ δὲ ἐμπόρφυρος.

¹¹ Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 712: νιτροποιὸς γῆ, and Eustathius, *Comm. ad Dionys.* 530: ἐπιτηδεύει εἰς νίτρον κατασκευήν.

¹² Cretae plura genera. ex iis Cimoliae duo ad medicos pertinentia.

¹³ Sarda, quae adfertur e Sardinia, . . . est vilissima omnium Cimoliae generum.

¹⁴ Dioscorides (*l.c.*): πρὸς τὴν ἀφὴν κατὰ ψυχρος. Pliny (*l.c.*): Et refrige-

upon colors.¹⁵ So the striga that sucks the life-blood of her victims leaves them cold and colorless. Surely the epithet is apposite enough. The striga is a human *Κιμωλία*.

With our next gloss — strix, *ὄλολυγών* — should be compared the Cyrillan glosses, *ὄλολυγών*, *ulula*, strix, and *ὄλολυγή*, *ulula*, and the Philoxenian gloss — *ulula*, *ὄλολυγών*, *ὄλολυγή*. Here might seem to be some compelling evidence for a late identification of the strix with an owl, as the Latin lexica define *ulula* only as 'an owl,' or 'a screech owl.' A year ago I considered these glosses as one of the earliest extant identifications of the strix and owl. It will be noted, however, that our gloss is but half, and that, too, the secondary half, which is so commonly figurative, of the former gloss quoted from Cyrillus. *Ὅλολυγών* and *ulula* are the primaries, as are also *ὄλολυγή* and *ulula*. The significance of this will appear in the sequel.

The *Sylloge* of Bonaventura Vulcanius, published in 1500, but drawn from ancient sources, defines *ὄλολυγή* by *ululatus*. Accordant with this are the definitions given by Hesychius,¹⁶ with which all later ones essentially agree. So we are driven to conclude either (1), with Salmasius,¹⁷ that *ulula* is here used in its etymological meaning, synonymous with *ululatus*, or (2) that the gloss is erroneous,¹⁸ or (3) contains information now unknown from other sources.

randi quoque natura cretae est. Athen. 123 D: Σῆμος δ' ὁ Δῆλιος ἐν δευτέρῃ Νησιάδος ἐν Κιμώλῳ τῇ νήσῳ φησὶ ψυχρεῖα κατεσκευάσθαι θέρους ὀρυκτά, ξηθα χλιεροῦ ὕδατος πλήρη κεράμια καταθέντες κομίζονται χιόνος οὐδὲν διάφορα. Cf. also its medical use for inflammation, erysipelas, herpes, falling hair, wounds, fistula, etc. See Dioscorides, *l.c.*, and Pliny, *N.H.* xxi, 20, 138; xxvi, 11, 121; xxxiv, 15, 155; xxviii, 11, 163.

¹⁵ *Sarda . . . candidis (vestibus) tantum adsumitur, inutilis versicoloribus, . . . veros autem et pretiosos colores emollit Cimolia. . . . candidis vestibus saxum (a superior Cimolia) utilis a sulphure, inimicum coloribus*; Pliny, xxxv, 17, 196 f.

¹⁶ *Ὅλολυγή· ποιά φωνή λυπηρά, ὀδύνην καρδίας ἀσήμεν τινα φθόγγῳ παριστῶσα.*

Ὅλολυγή· φωνή γυναικῶν, ἣν ποιοῦνται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐχόμεναι· καὶ ἀνθος τι παρὰ λίμναις γινόμενον.

¹⁷ In his *Plinianae Exercitationes* in C. J. Solini *Polyhistora* (ed. 1689, p. 942): "Apud Aristotelem *ὄλολυγών* vox est ranarum muscularum, id est, *ulula*, nam et *ululam* Latini pro *ululatu* posuerunt, ut *resonam* pro *resonatione*. Glossae *ὄλολυγή*, *ulula*."

¹⁸ I believe this is the proper conclusion. The error might easily arise from

Whichever conclusion we accept for the *ulula* of the latter gloss will hold also for the former. A study of the word *ὄλολυγών* in all the passages cited by lexicographer or commentator from the literature still extant shows clearly its original meaning and later semantic development. The latter is entirely normal. Owing to its length, only a synopsis of the study can be presented here. *ὄλολυγών* is primarily an onomatopoeia from the cry of the male frog in the mating season. So it is in Aristotle (*H.A.* iv, 9, 5 f.), Aelian (*N.A.* ix, 13), and Plutarch (ii, 982 E). It next becomes a name for the frog itself, whether a land, water, or tree frog. See Aelian (*N.A.* vi, 19), Theocritus (7, 139), Theophrastus (*de Sig. Pluv.* 3, 5), Aratus (*Phaen.* 948), Strabo (xvii, 2, 4), the *Geoponica* (i, 3, 11), Agathias (*Anthol.* v, 291), and Pliny (xi, 37, 172). In a fragment from Eubulus (Kock, ii, 199 f.) and in another from Nicaenetus, preserved by Parthenius, there may be the third meaning, 'one distraught with the passion of love.' This is only a vivid metaphor from the amatory frog and is not really necessary, as the passages may be interpreted literally. So much for the classical authors. There is no need of importing 'owl' or bird of any kind, notwithstanding a few scholiasts and some later commentators who copy from them. Every statement made of the *ὄλολυγών* finds an ample explanation in the frog-world.¹⁹ Why, then, should the epithet *ὄλολυγών* be applied to the strix? An ample explanation of this will be found in the subjoined notes,²⁰ upon the eminent authority of Gadow in his *Amphibia and Reptiles*, vol. viii of the *Cambridge Natural History*.

any one of various abbreviated forms of *ululatus*, e.g. VLVLAT̄, *ululat̄*, *ululat̄*, *ululat̄*, *ululat̄*, etc. The sign of abbreviation might be lost in various ways, as fading of ink, illegibility, ignorance or carelessness of a copyist, etc. The resultant *ululat̄*, mistaken for a verb, would inevitably be emended to the substantive *ulula*. We have an instance, in fact, of this very error. One of the *Hermeneumata Montepessulana* (Götz, *C. G. L.* iii, 305, 33) reads: *ὀλλυγών* (sic), *ululat̄*. Götz (vii, 381) reverses this, *ulula(t)*, *ὄλολυγών*. As the gloss is under the heading *Περὶ ἐρπετῶν*, it must refer to the frog and not to the owl or any other bird. The original gloss must have been *ὄλολυγών*, *ululatus*.

¹⁹ This will appear in detail in the completed study of the word.

²⁰ The tree frog (*Hyla arborea*). "The congregating males make a great noise and take to the water before the females, which join them when they are

That the ancients were acquainted with the amatory habits of the frogs is shown not only by the explicit statements of Aelian, Aristotle, Pliny, Plutarch, and others in the passages cited, but also from its use as an aphrodisiac in medicine,²¹ and as an ingredient in magic philtres,²² etc.

In the *Hermeneumata Amploniana* (C. G. L. III, 89, 60) we find a further reference to this nature of the frog: ololygon, uluccus, urtica. The second and figurative member must be related to its Juvenalian sense, 'lustful desire, pruriency.'

There is, then, an especial appositeness in applying the specific term *δολολυγών*, with all its connotation, rather than *βάτραχος*, to the Aphrodisian strix, the strix of the licentious orgies of the Sabat with its *concupitus daemonum*.

The last of our Philoxenian glosses — strix, *στρουθός* — is

ready to spawn. The male grasps his mate near the shoulders and the pair swim about together, sometimes for days, until the eggs are expelled"; p. 193.

The land frog (*Rana temporaria*). "The male puts its arms around the chest of the female, behind her arms, and the embrace is so firm that nothing will induce him to loosen his hold. The process becomes an involuntary reflex action, a cramp which may last for days, or even for weeks, if sudden cold weather sets in, until the female is ready to expel the eggs. . . . Their (the males') ardor is so great that they occasionally get hold not only of the wrong kind of frogs, but of toads or even fishes, and if not taken off by force, they fasten on to anything else, a log or on to your own fingers"; p. 255.

The water frog (*Rana esculenta*). "The male clasps the female under the arms, throwing its own around her breast, the nuptial grey excrescences on its inner fingers pressing against her skin, the palms being turned outward. The embrace does not last long, rarely extending over a few days"; p. 268 f.

These are the common frogs of Greece, as will appear from Boulenger's *Catalogue of Batrachia in the British Museum*, pp. 379, 44, 39.

²¹ Pliny (*N.H.* xxxii, 10, 139): Venerem concitant . . . iocur ranae diopetis vel calamitis in pellicula gruis adalligatum, etc.

²² In Horace (*Epod.* 5, 19 ff.), frog and strix are associated:

Et uncta turpis ova ranae sanguine
Plumamque nocturnae strigis.

Cf. also Propertius, III, 6, 27:

Illum turgentis ranae portenta rubetae
Et lecta exectis anguibus ossa trahunt.

Also Pliny, xxxii, 5, 49: Addunt etiamnum alia Magi, quae si vera sint, multo utiliores vitae existuntur ranae quam leges: namque harundine transfixis a natura per os si surculus in menstruis defigatur a marito, adulterorum taedium fieri.

again: the secondary and metaphorical half of the Cyrillan *στρουθός*, passer, strix. Here, also, the figure is quite obviously due to the Aphrodisiac nature of the strix. Salacity is the most outstanding attribute of the sparrow in the classic authors. A few illustrations will suffice.

In Sappho's famous *Ode to Aphrodite* we find the sparrow consecrated to the service of this goddess:

κάλοι δέ σ' ἄγον
ὥκεες στρουθοὶ περὶ γᾶς μελαίνας
πύκνα δίννεντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνω αἶθε-
ρος διὰ μέσσω.

Athenaeus, 391 E, gives as reason for this: *καὶ γὰρ ὀχευτικὸν τὸ ζῶον καὶ πολύγονον. τίκτει γοῦν ὁ στρουθός, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης, καὶ μέχρι ὀκτώ.* He quotes Terpsicles also, to this effect: *τοὺς ἐμφαγόντας στρουθῶν ἐπικαταφόρους πρὸς ἀφροδίσια γίνεσθαι.*

Eustathius, *ad Il.* B, 308, corroborates these, saying: 'Ἡ δὲ στρουθὸς εἶδος μικροῦ ὀρνέου ἀνειμένου τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ διὰ τε τὸ ὥς ἐν μεγέθει οὐ μεγάλῳ πολύγονον, ὥς ἐρρήθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ χαίρειν τῇ μίξει. He adds a fanciful etymology of the word, ὅθεν καὶ στρουθὸς λέγεται παρὰ τὸ μετὰ οἴστρου θέειν.

Clearchus in his *Περὶ τοῦ Πανικοῦ* further illustrates this nature of the sparrow: *Οἱ στρουθοὶ προίενται γονήν, οὐ μόνον ἰδόντες τὰς θηλείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκούσωσι φωνὴν αὐτῶν· τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ἢ τῇ ψυχῇ ἐγγινομένη φαντασία περὶ πλησιασμῶν.*²³

On the Latin side we find Pliny (x, 36, 107): *Passeri minimum vitae, cui salacitas par.* Hence Stephanus (*The-saurus*, s.v. *στρουθός*) says: *Plinius quoque aviculas eas esse salacissimas testatur.*

Festus (xvii) gives us one result of this characteristic: *Strutheum in mimis praecipue vocant obscaenam partem virilem, a salacitate videlicet passeris, qui Graece στρουθός dicitur.* Hesychius gives us another: *στρουθός· ὁ καταφε-ρής, καὶ λάγνος*,—the very metaphor we have in applying the term to the strix. With this we may compare our "chippy."

²³ See Athenaeus, 389 F, and Eustath. *ad Od.* A, 253.

We find as late as 1523, in the *Strix* of Pico della Mirandola, *l'immagine d'una passera*²⁴ still associated with an Italian *strega*.

The *Glossaria Labbaei* contain also these additional glosses: striga, γένος ὀρνέου, and — strix, στρίγξ, σύαγρος. The notation employed shows that the first of these is from the *Excerpta* made by Stephanus from unedited glossaria. Its vagueness as a definition reminds us of Pliny's statement, — sed quae sit avium constare non arbitror. This is simply the vague and undefined strix of classical antiquity, sufficiently presented in the former article.

The second gloss — strix, στρίγξ, — as indicated by the notation, is from the *Sylloge* of Bonaventura Vulcanius, hence probably from a fairly old source. It gives us a cognate Hellenic form for the Latin, the form we have already seen in the emendation of the folk-ditty preserved by Festus in a quotation from Verrius.²⁵

With these we may compare the grammarian Herodianus (396, 26 f.): στρίξ καὶ στρίγξ, εἶδος ὀρνέου, ὅπερ τινὲς καὶ διὰ τοῦ λ γράφουσι στλίγξ.²⁶ This latter is an interesting instance of lallation in Greek.

The last Labbaean gloss — strix, σύαγρος — is from the *Onomasticon Argentorati*, published in 1536, but of unknown date in content. This use of the word σύαγρος is otherwise unknown, as it is glossed elsewhere only by *aper*.²⁷

A study of the attributes of the σύαγρος suggests three bases of comparison with the strix. One of these is its daimonic character. This is Indo-European in its range. Thus, in the *Rig Veda*, I, 61, 7^d; 121, 11^{cd}; VIII, 77, 10^d, and x, 99, 6^d, the daimon Vṛtra assumes the form of a wild boar (*varāham*). So do the Maruts, or storm deities, in I, 88, 5^d and x,

²⁴ See the Tuscan translation, *La Strega*, Milan, 1864, p. 79.

²⁵ See p. 146 of the former article.

²⁶ So also Theognostus, a Byzantine grammarian of the ninth century: στρίξ, εἶδος ὀρνέου. εὔρεται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ στλίξ μετὰ τοῦ λ. See Cramer's *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, II, 41, 132.

²⁷ So the Pseudo-Cyrrillus and the *Hermeneumata Leidensia* (Götz, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* III, 18, 42), *Hermeneumata Monacensia* (*Ib.* 189, 29), *Hermeneumata Montepessulana* (*Ib.* 320, 14), etc.

67, 7°. In I, 114, 5^a Rudra, god of the winds and father of the Maruts, is the red wild-boar of the sky (*divó varāhām aruṣām*). In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Indra is said to have taken the form of a wild boar immediately after his birth. In the *Bahrām Yasht* (xv, 5, 15) of the Avesta, Verethraghna came in his fifth epiphany "running in the shape of a boar (*varāsa*), opposing the foes, a sharp-toothed male boar, a sharp-jawed boar, that kills at one stroke, pursuing, wrathful, with a dripping face, strong, and swift to run and rushing before."²⁸ This daimonic character appears in those forms of the myth of Adonis in which Ares (Serv. *ad Verg. Ecl.* 10, 18), or Apollo (Ptol. Chennus, I, p. 183, Wester.), transforming himself into a boar, kills Adonis. It appears also in such myths as those of the Erymanthian boar (Apollod. *Bibl.* II, 83 ff.) and of the Calydonian boar sent by Artemis to wreak a terrible vengeance for the neglect of her by Oineus (*Il.* ix, 538 ff.). Du Cange (*Glossar. Lat.*) says: "Aper significat diabolum, edacem ferum," and cites Papias and the Vulgate (*Ps.* lxxix, 14):

Exterminavit eam aper de silua
et singularis ferus depastus est eam.²⁹

A second ground for the comparison may be found in the ferocity of the *σύαγρος*, the most dangerous wild animal of classical Greece and Italy, the "man-eater" of those lands. To its savage nature the ancients traced its name.³⁰ To it the poets repeatedly refer; e.g. Homer, Θ, 338 ff.; Λ, 292 f., 414 ff.; Μ, 41 f., 145 f.; Ν, 471 ff.; Π, 823 f.; Vergil, *Aen.* I, 324; IV, 157 f.; x, 708 ff., etc. The beast is called *ferox* (Verg. *Aen.* x, 711; Ovid, *Met.* iv, 722; Mart. ix, 57, 11), *saevus* (Verg. *Geor.* III, 248), *violentus* (Sen. *Dial.* VIII, 733), *trux* (Ovid, *Met.* x, 713), *frendens* (Id. *Ars.* I, 46), *obliquo*

²⁸ Darmesteter's translation, *S.B.E.* XXIII.

²⁹ From the Septuagint: 'Ελυμήνατο αὐτὴν σὺς ἐκ δρυμοῦ | καὶ μονὺς ἀγριος κατενέμῃσατο αὐτὴν. The swine of the Gadarenes were not the first to be "possessed."

³⁰ Cf. Athen. ix, 401 C: παρὰ τὸ σεύεσθαι γὰρ καὶ ὀρμητικῶς ἔχειν τὸ ζῶον εἴρηται, and Isid. *Orig.* XII, I, 27: Aper a feritate vocatur . . . unde et apud Graecos σύαγρος, id est ferus dicitur.

dente timendus (Id. *Epist.* iv, 104), *horrens* (Lucr. v, 25), etc. Of the Calydonian boar, Homer (I, 546) says,

πολλοὺς δὲ πυρῆς ἐπέβησ' ἀλεγυεινῆς,

and Ovid (*Met.* viii, 360 ff.) has names for some of these. This was the extreme instance, but Adonis, as we have seen, and Idmon, the μάντις of the Argonauts (Apollod. *Bibl.* i, 126), were killed by boars, and Odysseus (τ, 450) was once sorely wounded by one. Centuries later an anonymous Byzantine poet represents the beast himself uttering the proud boast :

Ἐχω τ' ὡς ἄρμα δυνατὸν εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τῆς μάχης,
ὅταν ἐχθρὸς μὲ πολεμῇ ἄδικα νὰ μὲ φάγῃ
μετὰ τοῦ ὀδόντος κρούω τον καὶ σχίζω τον αὐτίκα
καὶ χύνω τὴν κοιλίαν του καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς του.³¹

A third comparison between the *σῶαγρος* and the *strix* is due to the lustful nature of each. For this reason the hog was consecrated to Aphrodite. Thus Athenaeus (iii, 95 F) tells us : ὅτι δ' ὄντως Ἀφροδίτῃ ὡς θύεται μαρτυρεῖ Καλλίμαχος ἢ Ζηνόδοτος ἐν ἱστορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασι γράφων ὧδε — Ἀργεῖοι Ἀφροδίτῃ ὕν θύουσι, καὶ ἡ ἑορτὴ καλεῖται ὑστῆρια.

Strabo (ix, 438) also mentions Callimachus as authority for this worship : Καλλίμαχος μὲν οὖν φησιν ἐν τοῖς ἰάμβοις τὰς Ἀφροδίτας (ἡ θεὸς γὰρ οὐ μία) τὴν Καστυνήτιν ὑπερβάλλεσθαι πάσας τῷ φρονεῖν, ὅτι μόνῃ παραδέχεται τὴν τῶν ὕδων θυσίαν. This sacrifice is confirmed by Dionysius Periegetes (852 f.), Ἀσπενδον . . . ἐνθα συοκτονήσι Διωναίην ἰλάονται, and by Avienus (*Descr. Orb. Ter.* 106 f.) : Aspendus . . . Sus ubi deformis calidis adoletur in aris | Saepe Dionaeae Veneri.

The character of this Castnian Aphrodite is set forth by Tzetzes (*ad Lycophr.* 403) : τὴν Ἀφροδίτην, τὴν μοιχαλίδα, Καστυνίαν δὲ τὴν ἀδελφοποιόν, τοὺς γὰρ ξένους, ἀδελφοὺς καὶ φίλους τὰ ἐρωτικά ποιοῦσιν. οἱ γὰρ ἐρώντες φωραθέντες λέγουσιν· ἀδελφή μου ἢ συγγενής μου ἔστι. He then explains her surname Μελιναία as διὰ τὸ ἡδὺ τῆς συνουσίας.

As Καστυνίον was hard by Aspendus, an Argive colony,

³¹ Διήγησις παιδιόφραστος τῶν τετραπόδων ζώων, 406 ff. in G. Wagner, *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*.

this form of the cult⁸² was probably imported from Argos, though Eustathius (*Comm. ad Dion. Per., l.c.*) makes its origin purely local.

Antiphanes in his *Corinthia* (Kock, II, 61, 126) reports a similar cult in Cyprus:

ἔπειτα κάκροκώλιον

ὔειον Ἀφροδίτῃ; γέλοιον. B. ἀγνοεῖς;

ἐν τῇ Κύπρῳ δ' οὕτω φιληθεῖ ταῖς ὑσίν,

ὧ δέσποθ', ὥστε σκατοφαγεῖν ἀπείρξε

τὸ ζῶον . . . τοὺς δὲ βοῦς ἡνάγκασεν.

Another reference to the cult is found in Aesop (*Fab.* 408). The boar swears by Aphrodite, his patron deity, that he will rend the dog to pieces with his tusks. The dog replies: καλῶς κατὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἡμῖν ὀμνύεις· δηλοῖς γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ὅτι μάλιστα φιλεῖσθαι, ἢ τὸν τῶν σῶν ἀκαθάρτων σαρκῶν γενομένον οὐδ' ὅλως εἰς ἱερὸν προσίεται. The boar, in his reply, shows that there is another interpretation of this: διὰ τοῦτο μὲν οὖν μᾶλλον δήλη ἐστὶν ἡ θεὸς στέργουσά με· τὸν γὰρ κτείναντα ἢ ἄλλως λυμαινόμενον παντάπασιν ἀποστρέφεται.

Other writers refer to the Aphrodisian nature of the σῦαγρος. A few typical instances must suffice.

Artemidorus (*Oneiroc.* II, 12) states the evil significance of this animal in dreams. Among his specifications, we find: καὶ τῷ γαμοῦντι οὔτε εὖνουν, οὔτε ἑπιεικῇ τὴν γυναῖκα παρίστησιν. . . . καὶ εἰκότως γυναῖκα σημαίνει· οὕτω γὰρ λέγονται κατωφερεῖς. καὶ τὸ κάπροις κακὸδαιμον Μένανδρός φησιν.

Georgius Pisides in his *Ἐξαήμερον*, 768, characterizes the σῦας as πόρνοους.

Varro (*R.R.* II, 4, 9 f.) tells us of an ancient custom:

Nuptiarum initio antiqui reges ac sublimes viri in Etruria in conjunctione nuptiali nova nupta et novus maritus primum porcum immolant. prisci quoque Latini, etiam Graeci in Italia idem factitasse videntur. nam et nostrae mulieres, maxime nutrices, naturam qua[m] feminae sunt in virginibus appellant porcum, et graece *choeron*, significantes esse dignum insigne nuptiarum.

⁸² Dümmmler, in Pauly-Wissowa, gives references to epigraphical and other evidence for the offering of swine to Aphrodite in Thessaly and Lesbos. Gubernatis (*Zool. Myth.* 343) states that the swine was consecrated to Freyr, the Scandinavian Aphrodite, and that in the Edda her chariot is drawn by a boar.

With this we may compare the definition of *χοῖρος* in Suidas: τὸ ζῷον. παρὰ Κορινθίους δὲ τὸ γυναικεῖον αἰδοῖον. ἔνθεν καὶ παροιμία. Ἀκροκορινθία ἔοικας χοιροπωλήσειν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔοικας μισθαρνήσειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἐταῖραι.

The daimonic *σύαγρος* was but a faint counterpart of that malevolent, maleficent, Tartarean strix that not only plagued mortals in this life but was also an instrument in the punishment of the damned. The ferocious *σύαγρος* had its counterpart in that ruthless, savage woman that at pleasure doffed her human form and attributes and donned those of bird or beast, and, as the very antithesis of all that is womanly, found her especial delight in preying upon defenceless infants in their cradles. Thus the daimonic and the feral elements doubtless contributed much in the application of the term *σύαγρος* to the strix or striga. Each of them augmented the appositeness of the epithet. Yet, perhaps, the third element, the same that was operative in the cases of *ὀλολυγών* and *στρουθός*, contributed still more. The strigine woman, detested and abominated, yet feared, was by these names pilloried before the public gaze as an ardent Aphrodisian, a creature contemptible far beyond the common harlot in that she was the consort and paramour, not of fellow human beings, but of the devil and his minions at the unspeakable Sabat.

In the *Hermeneumata Montepessulana* (*C. G. L.* III, 319, 4) we have the gloss, *νυκτικόραξ*, striga. The last definition of *στρίγλος* in Hesychius is οἱ δὲ *νυκτικόρακα*. This is not the definition of Hesychius himself, but one which he reports on the authority of an anonymous οἱ. This is the only ancient evidence found which seeks to identify the strix with a definite bird. But what was the *νυκτικόραξ*? A preliminary survey of its literature shows that the ancients were rather at sea when they sought to identify the bird. In the *C. G. L.* III, 18, 2; 188, 24; 258, 1, and 936, 4, it is glossed by *bubo*, which we cannot accept, as it contravenes the explicit testimony of Aristotle (*H. A.* VIII, 3). In III, 90, 8 it is glossed by *cadrio*, which Götz supposes to be the *charadrius*, glossed in V, 445, 17 by *fulica*, *sturnus*. In IV, 261, 38 it is *noctua*

avis. In iv, 374, 38 it is translated by the A. S. *naechthraebn*. In iii, 500, 77 it is simply *nocturnus corvus*. Theodorus Gaza translates it (Arist. *l.c.*) by *cicuma*. Apollinarius Laodiceus (*Ps.* ci, 12 = our cii, 6) translates the Hebrew word usually rendered owl by *νυκτὸς κόρακα*. The *κόραξ νυκτερινός* of Lucian (*Luc.* 12) is taken over by Apuleius in his version as *bubo*. Hesychius and Suidas are non-committal. The former simply says *ὁ νυκτὶ πετόμενος* and the latter's statement would apply to various birds — *εἶδος ὀρνέου ἐρημικοῦ ὃ τὰς οἰκουμένας φεύγον τῶν οἰκῶν, ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ καταλελυμέναις προστρέχει*. Isid. *Origg.* xii, 7, 41 explains it: *noctua, quia noctem amat. est enim avis luctifuga et solem videre non patitur*. Strabo (xvii, 2, 4) describes it thus: *παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ αἰετοῦ μέγεθος ἴσχει καὶ φθέγγεται βαρὺ· ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ κολοίου μέγεθος καὶ φθογγὴ διάφορος*. Thompson (*A Glossary of Greek Birds*), to whom the foregoing is supplementary, thinks it is probably an owl, but, perhaps, also the night-heron, as in modern Greek.

The *νυκτικόραξ*, according to Boio (*Ant. Lib.* xv), was *κακάγγελον*, and the clever skit of Nicarchus (*Anth. Graec.* xi, 186) defines a special province of its portent:

Νυκτικόραξ ἄδει θανατηφόρον· ἀλλ' ὅταν ᾄσῃ
Δημόφιλος, θνήσκει καὶ τὸς ὁ νυκτικόραξ.

Both *strix* and *bubo*, too, were birds of evil omen and notorious harbingers of war and death. Hence these identifications in the glosses are not surprising. But do they rest upon anything more substantial? *Nycticorax* and *bubo* are demonstrably mutually exclusive terms. *Nycticorax*, whether owl or heron or coot or starling, and *striga* are demonstrably mutually exclusive terms. Hence the glosses are manifestly erroneous, if taken literally as identifying; but substantially correct, if taken figuratively as expressive of outstanding resemblances in the folk-lore associated with the three terms. Upon this precarious foundation, and this alone, apparently, rests all the justification for the ornithological designation of the sub-order of Owls and for the statements in some commentaries upon the *strix* in the classics.

This study of the glosses is but a part of a larger study of the literature of the strix, ancient, mediaeval, and modern. The interpretations given are consistent with that which precedes and that which follows the period of the glosses. The glosses supply certain lacunae in the story. They open up vistas in the once existent folk-lore of the strix and reveal its unsuspected reaches in certain directions. They show the persistence of the popular belief in the strix as both bird and woman, as *magicienne*, uncanny and ruthless, feared as a vampire, abhorred as a cannibal. They show that their sources were literary, rather than popular usage, as three of the four striking metaphors are associated with the old term strix of the literature, rather than with the newer *striga* that so completely supplanted it in the popular speech.

The study of the glossographers has produced order out of chaos in *ὁλοθυγών*. It has shown the essential consistency of various glosses that at first sight seemed so incompatible not only with the references in the classical authors, but also with one another. It has shown that the only apparent bases for the modern identification of strix and owl are certain similarities in popular superstitions. It has shown the play of the popular fancy in fashioning various uncomplimentary and picturesque metaphors, each thoroughly expressive of the abiding belief in the moral turpitude, or even the total depravity, of the woman thought to be a strix. It has given us such a vivid view of this popular animus against those suspected of strigism as enables us better to understand the long struggle of the Christian Church to eradicate this superstition from the minds of its members, and the endeavors of kings and prelates to legislate for the protection of those so accused. It illustrates the drift toward a condition of things which led to organized strigism, with its counter-evangel and counter-ritual, and the ultimate warfare of the church to suppress it.